University of Zurich[UZH]

Zurich Open Repository and Archive
University of Zurich
University Library
Strickhofstrasse 39
CH-8057 Zurich
www.zora.uzh.ch

Year: 2021

Debating Temple and Torah in the Second Temple Period: Theological and Political Aspects of the Final Redaction(s) of the Pentateuch

Hensel, Benedikt

Abstract: Contrary to the current majority view, the formation process of early Judaism(s) reflects less an innovative achievement of an elite group of Judean exiles than a complex and multilayered process of negotiation between diverse groups. The most prominent and well researched groups that come to mind here are the Judean and the Samarian group(s). This thesis leads to the corollary that the late texts of the Hebrew Bible reflect this debate, especially with regard to the two most impactful religious and cultural-historical achievements of the post-exilic epoch, namely the temple, the cult centralization and the Torah. To illustrate this argument, article deals with the Judean and Samarian involvement in the production of the Pentateuch/Hexateuch. The article focuses on two particular Pentateuchal traditions regarding cult centralization, the late Persian redactional additions Deut 11:29–30; Deut 27* and the late Priestly texts. This uncovers a crucial debate revolving around the two important post-exilic institutions of temple and Torah, which, in turn, helps to understand the redactional processes of the final redaction(s) of the Pentateuch. In sum, the article provides a necessary clarification and modification of the modern theory of the so-called Common Torah, that is the Pentateuch understood as a Judean-Samarian co-production.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.1628/978-3-16-159854-8

Posted at the Zurich Open Repository and Archive, University of Zurich
ZORA URL: https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-204737
Book Section
Published Version

The following work is licensed under a Creative Commons: Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) License.

Originally published at:
Hensel, Benedikt (2021). Debating Temple and Torah in the Second Temple Period: Theological and Political Aspects of the Final Redaction(s) of the Pentateuch. In: Witte, Markus; Schröter, Jens; Lepper, Verena M. Torah, Temple, Land : Constructions of Judaism in Antiquity = Tora, Tempel, Land. Konstruktionen des Judentums in der Antike. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 27-48.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.1628/978-3-16-159854-8

Debating Temple and Torah in the Second Temple Period

Theological and Political Aspects of the Final Redaction(s) of the Pentateuch[1]

Benedikt Hensel

1. Introduction

As recent scholarship has increasingly recognized, the exilic and early postexilic period has had a major impact on the theological and literary history of the Hebrew Bible, while shaping other central identity markers, such as the institution of the central temple and the Torah. Most research assumes that *Judean* Golah groups primarily determined the historical-theological developments in this so-called formative period. It is within this period that Israel develops – and here I am taking up the helpful distinction of Julius Wellhausen, which he established in *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*[2] – from "ancient Israel" of the preexilic monarchy to "Judaism" of the postexilic period, or – as Reinhard G. Kratz has re-worded it in a modern adaptation of Wellhausen's approach – from "historical" to "biblical Israel."[3]

While I fully agree with the impact of the early postexilic period on these formative processes – and with the general hermeneutical key that Wellhausen provides us in his distinction of the two modes of Israel for the studies of the Hebrew Bible –, I doubt the limitation to the Judean Golah. This is a historical picture, which is clearly influenced by the *interpretation* of history *within* the Hebrew Bible. A growing number of scholars has come to recognize

[1] This article is the result of a broader project entitled "The History of the Pentateuch: Combining Literary and Archaeological Approaches," funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation (Sinergia project CRSII1 160785). The project – a joint venture of the universities of Zurich, Lausanne and Tel Aviv – is directed by Konrad Schmid (Zurich), Christophe Nihan and Thomas Römer (Lausanne), and Israel Finkelstein and Oded Lipschits (Tel Aviv). I wish to thank Dr. Kenneth Brown (University of Mainz) for his helpful comments and for improving my English.

[2] See J. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient History* (Cleveland: World Publishing Company, 1965).

[3] See, e.g., R.G. Kratz, *Historical and Biblical Israel*, trans. P.M. Kurtz (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015); id., *The Composition of the Narrative Books of the Old Testament*, trans. J. Bowden (London: T&T Clark, 2005).

that a multiplicity of Yahwistic groups existed inside and outside Judah in the postexilic period.[4] The Yahwistic group in the province and region of Samaria, with its cultic center at Mount Gerizim, is certainly the most prominent group. These Samarian Yahwists – later known as "Samaritans" – have returned to a position of focal interest in Hebrew Bible research in recent years. Significant work along these lines includes the recent monographs on the Samaritans by Magnar Kartveit (2009),[5] Jan Dušek (2012),[6] Gary N. Knoppers (2013),[7] Reinhard Pummer (2016),[8] Raik Heckl (2016),[9] Benedikt Hensel (2016),[10] and Dany Nocquet (2017),[11] while a long-desired critical edition of the Samaritan Pentateuch is currently under way under the responsibility of Stefan Schorch (2018).[12]

Despite this growing sensibility towards the Samaritans in Biblical Studies, little attention has been given to the role of this group during the *formative pe-*

---

[4] On the phenomenon of Yahwistic diversity in the Second Temple period, see my article "Yahwistic Diversity and the Hebrew Bible: State of the Field, Desiderata and Research Perspectives in a Necessary Debate on the Formative Period of Judaism(s)," in *Yahwistic Diversity and the Hebrew Bible: Tracing Perspectives of Group Identity from Judah, Samaria, and the Diaspora in Biblical Traditions*, ed. B. Hensel, D. Nocquet, and B. Adamczewski, FAT 2/120 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020), 1–44. For comprehensive overviews, see D.V. Edelman, "Cultic Sites and Complexes beyond the Jerusalem Temple," ibid., 82–103; P.R. Davies, "Monotheism, Empire, and the Cult(s) of Yehud in the Persian Period," in *Religion in the Achaemenid Persian Empire: Emerging Judaisms and Trends*, ed. D.V. Edelman, A. Fitzpatrick-McKinley, and P. Guillaume, Orientalische Religionen in der Antike 17 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 24–35; J. Frey, "Temple and Rival Temple: The Cases of Elephantine, Mt. Gerizim, and Leontopolis," in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, Judentum und frühen Christentum*, ed. B. Ego, A. Lange, and P. Pilhofer, WUNT 118 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 171–203.

[5] M. Kartveit, *The Origin of the Samaritans*, VTSup 128 (Leiden: Brill, 2009).

[6] J. Dušek, *Aramaic and Hebrew Inscriptions from Mt. Gerizim and Samaria between Antiochus III and Antiochus IV Epiphanes*, CHANE 54 (Leiden: Brill, 2012). Dušek concentrates primarily on the Gerizim inscriptions. In two of the study's three chapters, however, he seeks to identify the YHWH-worshipers of Mount Gerizim (pp. 65–118 [chap. 2]) and to outline a history of the southern Levant between Antiochus III and Antiochus IV (pp. 119–151 [chap. 3]).

[7] G.N. Knoppers, *Jews and Samaritans: The Origins and History of Their Early Relations* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013).

[8] R. Pummer, *The Samaritans: A Profile* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2016).

[9] R. Heckl, *Neuanfang und Kontinuität in Jerusalem: Studien zu den hermeneutischen Strategien im Esra-Nehemia-Buch*, FAT 104 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016).

[10] B. Hensel, *Juda und Samaria: Zum Verhältnis zweier nach-exilischer Jahwismen*, FAT 110 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016).

[11] D. Nocquet, *La Samarie, la Diaspora et l'achèvement de la Torah: Territorialités et internationalités dans l'Hexateuque*, OBO 284 (Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2017).

[12] The first volume of this edition has been published in 2018: S. Schorch, ed., *The Samaritan Pentateuch: A Critical Editio Maior*, vol. 3: *Leviticus* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2018).

riod.[13] On the one hand, this may be due to the fact that compared with other sources, evidence of the Samaritans is meager in the Hebrew Bible. Modern scholarship has mainly followed the narration of Josephus and certain biblical traditions – especially the Deuteronomistic and Chronistic views of history, in which the history of Israel essentially takes place in Judah, with its exclusive center in Jerusalem, while the territory of the former Northern Kingdom plays *no role* after 722 and 587 BCE.[14] On the other hand, most modern scholars still suggest that there were serious religious conflicts and economic and political rivalries between Judah and Samaria that covered the whole Second Temple period – starting with the erection of the sanctuary on Mount Gerizim, which is identified as rival sanctuary. Some biblical texts do imply such a scenario (such as Ezra 4:1–5, 6 ff.; Neh 1–6; 2 Kgs 17:24–41),[15] with Josephus's *Antiquitates*[16] explicating it for the postexilic, especially for the Persian period.

All of this would seem to imply that there was little substantial contact between the groups – that is, that the Samarians were not involved in the exilic and postexilic expansion of the biblical text.

In recent years, however, we have found ourselves in the fortunate position of witnessing an extensive enlargement of the primary source material that documents the culture of the Samarian region, largely due to the archaeological excavations on Mount Gerizim,[17] the discovery of Samarian coins from the

---

[13] A few exceptions can be named here, however, esp. R. Heckl, "Die Rolle Samarias bei der Entstehung des Judentums: Auf dem Weg zu einer neuen Sicht der nachexilischen Geschichte Israels," *BZ* 62 (2018), 1–31; and B. Hensel, "Die Bedeutung Samarias für die formative Periode der alttestamentlichen Theologie- und Literaturgeschichte," *SJOT* 32.1 (2018), 20–48, with several fundamental considerations on the possible significance of Samaritanism and its possible influence in the formative period (both with discussion of recent literature). See also the volume by M. Kartveit and G.N. Knoppers, eds., *The Bible, Qumran, and the Samaritans: Proceedings of the Research Group "Samaritan Studies" at IOSOT, Stellenbosch 2016*, Studia Samaritana 10/SJ 104 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2018), that comprises several in-depth studies on certain (postexilic) biblical texts showing possible Samarian involvement.

[14] It was already lamented by Weippert in 1993 that reconstructions of the history of Israel in the twentieth century followed this specific biblical view, which he fittingly called "Sub-Deuteronomism" (M. Weippert, "Geschichte Israels am Scheideweg," *TRu* 58 [1993], 71–103, the term on p. 73). From today's perspective one may also add the Chronistic view amongst this reception history, which Schmid most recently termed "Sub-Chronicism" (cf. K. Schmid, "Overcoming the Sub-Deuteronomism and Sub-Chronicism of Historiography in Biblical Studies: The Case of the Samaritans," in Kartveit and Knoppers, *The Bible, Qumran, and the Samaritan* [see n. 13], 17–29, esp. 19).

[15] For an overview of how these texts influenced tradition and research, see Hensel, *Juda und Samaria* (see n. 10), 12 f. (with further literature).

[16] For essential reading on this subject, see R. Pummer, *The Samaritans in Flavius Josephus*, TSAJ 129 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009).

[17] The most important publication volumes of the excavation: Y. Magen, H. Misgav, and L. Tsfania, *Mount Gerizim Excavations*, vol. 1: *The Aramaic, Hebrew and Samaritan Inscriptions*, trans. E. Levin and M. Guggenheimer, Judea and Samaria Publications 2 (Jerusa-

Persian period, the bullae and papyrus finds in Wadi ed-Daliyeh, Adam Zertal's survey results in the Samarian region,[18] and the significant progress made in editing the sources[19] and placing them in cultural and religious history.[20] With

---

lem: Israel Antiquities Authority, 2004); and Y. Magen, *Mount Gerizim Excavations*, vol. 2: *A Temple City*, Judea and Samaria Publications 8 (Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority, 2008).

[18] See A. Zertal, *The Manasseh Hill Country Survey*, vol. 1: *The Shechem Syncline*; vol. 2: *The Eastern Valleys and the Fringes of the Desert*, CHANE 21/1–2 (Leiden: Brill, 2004–2008).

[19] The full edition of the Samaria papyri has been available since 2007 thanks to J. Dušek, *Les manuscrits araméens du Wadi Daliyeh et la Samarie vers 450–332 av. J.-C.*, CHANE 30 (Leiden: Brill, 2007). The nearly 400 inscriptions from Mount Gerizim in Aramaic, Hebrew, and Greek have been available in the *editio princeps* since 2004: Magen, Misgav, and Tsfania, *Mount Gerizim Excavations*, vol. 1 (see n. 17). The Samarian coins have been available in a well-edited book by Meshorer and Qedar since 1999 (Y. Meshorer and S. Qedar, *Samarian Coinage*, Numismatic Studies and Researches 9 [Jerusalem: Israel Numismatic Society, 1999]). More recent finds in Y. Ronen, "On the Chronology of the Yehud Falcon Coins," *Israel Numismatic Research* 4 (2009), 39–45. The seventy-two coins from the Persian period found at the sanctuary on Mount Gerizim are also potentially instructive. Regrettably, Magen has to date only been able to provide a very rough characterization of the coins and provides photographs of only twenty-six coins. He describes in a preliminary report on the excavations sixty-nine of the seventy-two coins (the other three were not identifiable) in a very rough and imprecise way (see his brief paragraph in Y. Magen, "The Dating of the First Phase of the Samaritan Temple on the Mount Gerizim in the Light of the Archaeological Evidence," in *Judah and the Judeans in the Fourth Century B.C.E.*, ed. O. Lipschits, G.N. Knoppers, and R. Albertz [Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2007], 157–211, here 179f.). Pictures of a total of twenty-six coins from the Persian period can be found in the same article on pp. 207–211 (fig. 27–29); cf. id., *Mount Gerizim Excavations*, vol. 2 (see n. 17), 196–199 (fig. 7, 19). The clay impression seals from Wadi ed-Daliyeh are published and analyzed in M.J.W. Leith, *Wadi Daliyeh*, vol. 1: *The Wadi Daliyeh Seal Impressions*, DJD 24 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997). A selection of the clay impression seals was first published in F.M. Cross, "The Papyri and Their Historical Implications," in *Discoveries in the Wâdi ed-Dâliyeh*, ed. P.W. Lapp and N.L. Lapp, AASOR 41 (Cambridge, Mass.: ASOR, 1974), 17–29. The seals published in E. Stern, "A Hoard of Persian Period Bullae from the Vicinity of Samaria," *Michmanim* 6 (1992), 7–30, probably come from the same find. The most recent publication on this topic is O. Keel, *Corpus der Stempelsiegel-Amulette aus Palästina/Israel von den Anfängen bis zur Perserzeit*, vol. 2: *Von Bahan bis Tell Eton*, OBO.SA 29 (Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg, 2010), 340–379. Only the excavation publications (see Magen's main publications mentioned in n. 17, also id., *The Samaritans and the Good Samaritan*, Judea and Samaria Publications 7 [Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority, 2008]) still omit various absolutely essential details such as the stratigraphy data. A desideratum is still the official publication of "a dozen Greek inscriptions" (4th–2nd/1st cent. BCE) that Magen mentioned in a short footnote of his excavation publication (Magen, Misgav, and Tsfania, *Mount Gerizim Excavations*, vol. 1 [see n. 17], 13; Meerson in a later article speaks of "five Greek inscriptions from the Hellenistic era ever found on Mount Gerizim," see M. Meerson, "One God Supreme: A Case Study of Religious Tolerance and Survival," *JGRChJ* 7 [2010], 32–50, here 32). I was able to publish one of those inscriptions in B. Hensel, "Cult Centralization in the Persian Period: Biblical and Historical Perspectives," *Sem* 60 (2018), 221–272, here

a view to these sources now available to us, it is possible to look beyond the historical scenarios proposed in the biblical and non-biblical literature and, by doing so, to cast doubt on the apparent certainties that research holds to be true.

Hence, in the following I will address the question of the significance of Samarian Yahwism in the Second Temple period, focusing on a possible Samarian involvement in the formation of the Pentateuch. In particular, the article will focus on two particular pentateuchal traditions regarding cult centralization, that is, one expressed in the Deuteronomy and one in the Priestly writings (P). This analysis uncovers a crucial debate on the two important postexilic institutions of the temple and the Torah, which, in turn, could help us to understand the processes surrounding the final redaction(s) of the Pentateuch. The insights of this study also provide an evaluation of the relatively new theory about a so-called Common or Inclusive Torah (the Pentateuch understood as a Judean-Samarian coproduction), suggesting several necessary changes, corrections and modulations.

2. The Sixth to Second Century BCE: Mutual and Creative Contacts

I have dealt with the relationship of Judah and Samaria in a monograph published in 2016.[21] Building on the discussions there, I would argue that describing the relations between Samarians and Judeans first in terms of competition

---

236–239. This inscription (on a sundial) could be a "little sensation" as it is the first attestation of Samaritans in Egypt (the donator of the sundial on Mount Gerizim clearly designates himself as "Ptolemaios […] of Egypt" [lines 2–3] besides the [often polemical] mentions of Samaritans by Josephus). I maintain that the inscription also mentions a Samaritan sanctuary in Egypt (αγιων, line 3; but the line is broken after this word).

[20] For a classification of the iconographic traditions on the Samarian clay bullae, see the excellent study in almost monographic dimensions by S. Schroer and F. Lippke, "Beobachtungen zu den (spät-)persischen Samaria-Bullen aus dem Wadi ed-Daliyeh: Hellenisches, Persisches und Lokaltraditionen im Grenzgebiet Yehûd," in *A "Religious Revolution" in Yehûd? The Material Culture of the Persian Period as a Test Case*, ed. C. Frevel and K. Pyschny, OBO 267 (Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014), 305–390. A comparative paleographic study of the Gerizim inscriptions was published by Dušek in 2012 (Dušek, *Inscriptions* [see n. 6]). For a critical review of the finds at the Mount Gerizim excavations as well as their placement in religious history, see J.K. Zangenberg, "The Sanctuary on Mount Gerizim: Observations on the Results of 20 Years of Excavation," in *Temple Building and Temple Cult: Architecture and Cultic Paraphernalia of Temples in the Levant (2.–1. Mill. BCE); Proceedings of a Conference on the Occasion of the 50th Anniversary of the Institute of Biblical Archaeology at the University of Tübingen (28–30 May 2010)*, ed. J. Kamlah, ADPV 41 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2012), 399–418; and Hensel, "Cult Centralization" (see n. 19), 227–239; id., *Juda und Samaria* (see n. 10), 35–76 (with particular reference to the often neglected city on Mount Gerizim).

[21] See Hensel, *Juda und Samaria* (see n. 10), and (with additional considerations) id.,

and then as separation are inadequate. I suggest instead an alternative *model of mutual contacts* for the period between the sixth and the second centuries BCE, which can be summarized as follows:

(1) In postexilic times two independent Yahwistic communities existed within the two provinces Samaria and Judah, each with distinct contours, but sharing a (predominantly) monotheistic Yahwism. The archaeological findings from Mount Gerizim suggest the comparatively early existence of a Samarian temple on Gerizim, showing that – already in the Persian period and also in the Hellenistic period, there were two sanctuaries devoted to the biblical God in the land of Israel. Taking all the findings together it is highly probable that a cult, even an aniconic one, was in place on Mount Gerizim that was largely comparable to that in Jerusalem.[22] Both communities saw themselves as self-standing denominations of "Israel" in the postexilic period.

(2) Samarian-Judean relations were in fact not constantly marred by bitter conflict, but rather reflected a state of parallel coexistence. This is especially true for the Persian period, not least because the two groups of YHWH-worshipers dwelled in different provinces. It was not before the late fourth or third century BCE that relations between Judah and Samaria slowly began to sour – initially due to political and economic rivalries resulting from the unification of Judah and Samaria into one larger province, meaning that two official Yahwist sanctuaries were – for the first time – forced to compete for the favor of the Ptolemaic and Seleucid potentates.[23] In the later historical development, this potential conflict increasingly affected both groups of YHWH-worshipers. The Jewish polemic against Samaritan YHWH-worshipers serves as an indication for existing tensions and conflicts between both denominations of "Israel." Polemics against the Gerizim community are attested *outside* the biblical canon only from the second half of the second century BCE, and then dramatically increased in the frequency of attestation and in the nature and variety of polemical statements. Corresponding religious conflicts between Samaritan and Jewish YHWH-worshipers most likely developed in the course of the fourth and third centuries. I recently adjusted these datings from my previous works (there: 3rd/2nd cent.) as the plausible origin of Samarian-Judean conflicts.[24] Seeing the biblical evidences that witness different polemical traditions and therefore different redactional circles (esp. Ezra 4:1 ff.; Chr; 2 Kgs 17:24–41), the critical notion towards the Samarians could have circled in Judean scribal

"On the Relationship of Judah and Samaria in Post-Exilic Times: A Farewell to the Conflict Paradigm," *JSOT* 44 (2019), 19–42.

[22] On the operations of the cult on Mount Gerizim, and especially how they can be inferred from the inscriptions and the remains of animal bones and ashes, see Hensel, *Juda und Samaria* (see n. 10), 40, 54–58.

[23] For the details, see Hensel, *Juda und Samaria* (see n. 10), 218–229, and id., "Cult Centralization" (see n. 19), 253 f.

[24] See Hensel, "Cult Centralization" (see n. 19), 251 f.

groups *before* it actually resulted in a more conflict-driven Samarian-Judean relationship for which there is no external evidence before the late second century BCE. Eventually, this resulted in the separation between the communities of Mount Gerizim and Mount Zion. From the end of the second century BCE, the formation of group-specific characteristics in both Israelite communities, as well as contrasting demarcation strategies, can be discerned.[25]

For the time prior to this parting of ways, however, it is important to note that the material culture of both provinces reveals a high degree of *mutual influence* on a cultural-historical level.[26] The commonalities between the groups are such that they cannot only have their basis in the shared cultural past of Israel and Judah in monarchical times. Rather, they allow the conclusion that regular interactions must have taken place between the two cultic communities across the full gamut of human activity. The two Yahwistic groups were in continuous contact with each other, interacting with each other on diverse levels (though especially among religious elites and scribes). As far as we know from the Elephantine correspondence *TAD* A4.7–4.9 (407 BCE), the religious or literate elites were at least in semi-regular contact with each other.[27] Thus, the Samaritan-Judean relations were not disrupted by deep conflicts, but rather predominantly shaped by the *coexistence* of both communities.

(3) These observations lead to another point that cannot be stressed enough: in the Second Temple period, the Gerizim community was of immense cultural, religious and religio-political significance. Given the prosperity and importance of the Samarian province and the relatively large number of YHWH-worshipers among the population in comparison to Judah, it is even possible to infer that the Samarians were the more important group in play here, and that far from declining, their significance grew during the Hellenistic period. The extensive expansion of both the city and the temple on Mount Gerizim in the third century, and again around 200 BCE,[28] may serve as evidence for this interpretation.

---

[25] On this, see S. Schorch, "The Construction of Samari(t)an Identity from the Inside and from the Outside," in *Between Cooperation and Hostility: Multiple Identities in Ancient Judaism and the Interaction with Foreign Powers*, ed. R. Albertz and J. Wöhrle, Journal of Ancient Judaism Supplements 11 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013), 135–149; Pummer, *The Samaritans* (see n. 8), 128–131; and Knoppers, *Jews and Samaritans* (see n. 7), 172–174.

[26] For a detailed analysis of all the evidence referenced here, see Hensel, *Juda und Samaria* (see n. 10), 35–162; and G.N. Knoppers, "Aspects of Samaria's Religious Culture during the Early Hellenistic Period," in *The Historian and the Bible: Essays in Honour of Lester L. Grabbe*, ed. P.R. Davies and D.V. Edelman, LHBOTS 530 (London: T&T Clark, 2010), 159–174; id., *Jews and Samaritans* (see n. 7), esp. 103–109.

[27] A comprehensive description of the contacts and interactions between Judah and Samaria is given by Hensel, *Juda und Samaria* (see n. 10), 163–229.

[28] For this city, see Magen, *Mount Gerizim Excavations*, vol. 2 (see n. 17).

3. Observations in Deuteronomy and the Priestly Writings: A Necessary Modification of the Theory of a Common Torah

If we start from this main observation of mutual and creative contacts as a plausible historical scenario for the Second Temple period, this sheds new light on the formation of the Hebrew Bible. We know that Samaritans use essentially the same Torah (or Pentateuch) as Judeans do, with only a few differences to which I will come back later. Against the backdrop of the Samarian-Judean relations outlined here, it seems unlikely that the Samarian YHWH-worshipers followed a purely *Judean* Torah from the Hasmonean period onwards,[29] as is still assumed by many scholars. In fact, there are good grounds for concluding that both groups participated in the formation of the Pentateuch – at least in the time of its supposed finalizing, in the late Persian period – thereby creating what might be termed a "Common Pentateuch" or a "Common Torah," which reflects the interest of both, the Judean and the Samarian group. The main idea is that this shared form of the Torah is not only a result of compromise between several influential *Judean* groups, but is mainly a reflection of what I call "binnen-israelitische Ausdifferenzierungsprozesse"[30] (which can be roughly translated as "negotiating processes *within* Israel"), which included also the Samaritans.[31]

---

[29] See C. Nihan, "The Torah between Samaria and Judah: Shechem and Gerizim in Deuteronomy and Joshua," in *The Pentateuch as Torah: New Models for Its Promulgation and Acceptance*, ed. G. N. Knoppers and B. M. Levinson (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2007), 187–223; and R. Pummer, "The Samaritans and Their Pentateuch," ibid., 237–269, for the fundamental questions, insights and critics on this traditional paradigm.

[30] Hensel, *Juda und Samaria* (see n. 10), 312 (for details on this matter, see ibid., 302–349).

[31] That the Torah in this sense is a "compromise document" or "common Pentateuch" (meaning: a Samarian-Judean coproduction of the Persian period) is currently proposed among others by Nihan, "The Torah between Samaria and Judah" (see n. 29); Pummer, "The Samaritans and Their Pentateuch" (see n. 29), 239–247; B. Hensel, *Die Vertauschung des Erstgeburtssegens in der Genesis: Eine Analyse der narrativ-theologischen Grundstruktur des ersten Buches der Tora*, BZAW 423 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011), 290–314, esp. 305–312; id., *Juda und Samaria* (see n. 10), 170–178; T. Römer, "Cult Centralization and the Publication of the Torah between Jerusalem and Samaria," in Kartveit and Knoppers, *The Bible, Qumran, and the Samaritans* (see n. 13), 79–92. All these models are, however, very different in how they detail the historical setting, that lead to this Common Torah, or how this "compromise" is precisely to be interpreted (for a detailed overview of the research, see Hensel, *Juda und Samaria* [see n. 10], 187–194). To my knowledge, the first scholar who did interpret the Pentateuch as Samaritan-Judean coproduction is Diebner, who – already in the 80s(!) – developed the idea of a "Kompromissdokument," which was mainly shaped (according to his interpretation) by Samaritan interests; see B. J. Diebner, "Genesis als Buch der antik-jüdischen Bibel: Eine unhistorisch-kritische Spekulation," *DBAT* 17 (1983), 81–98. The whole theory of a Common Torah is not uncontested, see, e. g., R. G. Kratz, *Historisches*

Of major interest to all parties in the postexilic period is of course the legitimation of the respective religious center. So in the following I will detail the idea behind the Common Torah, as I understand it, on the basis of two particular pentateuchal traditions regarding centralization, which can be seen to have taken their final shape within this Samarian-Judean debate.

*3.1 Deut 11:29–30 and Deut 27**

The Book of Deuteronomy features a distinctive concept of cult centralization. Deuteronomy 12 and related texts allow only one central shrine as the legitimate place for sacrificial offerings. This one *maqom* ("place") is not located or named within the whole book, but because of the supposed origin of the first edition of Deuteronomy in late monarchic or early exilic Judah, this place is usually assumed to refer to the temple in Jerusalem. Yet while Jerusalem is never named in Deuteronomy, Mount Gerizim is mentioned twice: the public ceremonies in Deut 11:26–32 and 27:1–26 are localized on Mount Gerizim and Mount Ebal, with Mount Gerizim being the mount of blessing (cf. Deut 11:29; 27:4 SP; 27:12). Additionally, the erecting of an altar on Mount Gerizim[32] is explicitly mentioned in Deut 27:4 SP. The alternative reading "Mount Ebal" in the Masoretic Text is arguably a later, polemical correction.[33]

---

und biblisches Israel: Drei Überblicke zum Alten Testament (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 243 f.

[32] On the altar in Deut 27, see R. Müller, "The Altar on Mount Gerizim (Deuteronomy 27:1–8): Center or Periphery?," in *Centres and Peripheries in the Early Second Temple Period*, ed. E. Ben Zvi and C. Levin, FAT 104 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 197–214.

[33] As is now commonly accepted, the reading of "Mount Gerizim" in Deut 27:4 SP (הרגריזים) represents the original reading. Several witnesses support this reading: Papyrus Giessen 19 (αργαριζ[ι]μ), Vetus Latina La^{19a} (*Garzin*), the Samareitikon (αργαρζιμ). The reading בהרגרזים is now also supported by a Dead Sea Scrolls fragment of Deut 27:4 b–6, dating to the late second/first century BCE (J. H. Charlesworth, "What Is a Variant? Announcing a Dead Sea Scrolls Fragment of Deuteronomy," *Maarav* 16 [2009], 201–212, 273–274; for a critical examination of the fragment whose provenance is not entirely clear, see U. Schattner-Rieser, "Garizim versus Ebal: Ein neues Qumranfragment samaritanischer Tradition?," *Early Christianity* 1 [2010], 277–281). The Masoretic Text reads in Deut 27:4 הַר עֵיבָל, as do most of the witnesses to the Septuagint. For the textual evidences of the "Gerizim" and "Ebal" reading, see Hensel, *Juda und Samaria* (see n. 10), 176–178. On the ideological change from "Gerizim" to "Ebal" (MT), see also Müller, "Altar" (see n. 32), 199–202, 212–214; Kartveit, *Origin* (see n. 5), 300–309; S. Schorch, "The Samaritan Version of Deuteronomy and the Origin of Deuteronomy," in *Samaria, Samarians, and Samaritans: Proceedings of the 7th International Conference of the Société d'Études Samaritaines, Papa (Hungary)*, ed. J. Zsengellér, Studia Samaritana 6 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011), 23–37, here 28; A. Schenker, "Le Seigneur choisira-t-il le lieu de son nom ou l'a-t-il choisi? L'apport de la Bible grecque ancienne à l'histoire du texte samaritain et massorétique," in *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo*, ed. A. Voitila and J. Jokiranta, JSJSup 126 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 339–351, here 349 n. 33; Pummer, "The Samaritans and Their Pentateuch" (see n. 29), 245; Nihan, "The Torah between Samaria and

There is a broad consensus amongst scholars that both references to Mount Gerizim are to be identified as redactional, part of a multilayered interpolation from the Persian period, added to the original legal corpus of Deut 12–26, 28* just *before* the final redaction of the Pentateuch. Research in this line is connected with the studies of Christophe Nihan,[34] Gary N. Knoppers,[35] and Reinhard Müller.[36] This view has recently also been put forward in the monumental commentary on Deuteronomy by Eckart Otto, published in 2016 ff.[37]

One implication of this theory is that the Jerusalem-centered Deuteronomy has been opened up by these additions for a concession towards the Samarian sanctuary.[38] It is observed by these scholars that within this redactional layer, Deut 27:4–8*, which specifies the erection of the altar on Mount Gerizim, is unmistakably reminiscent of the altar law in Exod 20:24–26,[39] which on its site tolerates a multiplicity of altars by stating that "in every place, where I [sc. YHWH] cause my name to be remembered I will come to you and bless you" (Exod 20:24 b). It is now assumed that through this allusion to Exod 20 a narrative "backdoor" is opened to see Mount Gerizim as *another* legitimate sanctuary. The altar in Deut 27:4–8 is thereby understood as a figurative depiction

---

Judah" (see n. 29), 187–223; Dušek, *Inscriptions* (see n. 6), 90 f. E. Eshel and H. Eshel, "Dating the Samaritan Pentateuch's Compilation in the Light of the Qumran Biblical Scrolls," in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and the Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*, ed. M. P. Shalom et al., VTSup 94 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 215–240, here 218, rely on the originality of the "Ebal" reading.

[34] See Nihan, "The Torah between Samaria and Judah" (see n. 29), 190–193.

[35] G. N. Knoppers, "The Northern Context of the Law-Code in Deuteronomy," *HeBAI* 4 (2015), 162–183.

[36] Müller, "Altar" (see n. 32), 202–213.

[37] See E. Otto, *Deuteronomium 12–34*, 2 vols., HThKAT (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 2016–2017), 1.1133 and 2.1930–1933; cf. also his other publications: "Das Deuteronomium zwischen Tetrateuch und Hexateuch," in *Das Deuteronomium im Pentateuch und Hexateuch: Studien zur Literaturgeschichte von Pentateuch und Hexateuch im Lichte des Deuteronomiumrahmens*, FAT 30 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 156–233, here 203 f.; id., "Born out of Ruins: The Catastrophe of Jerusalem as *Accoucheur* to the Pentateuch in the Book of Deuteronomy," in *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Rise of Torah*, ed. P. Dubovský, D. Markl, and J.-P. Sonnet, FAT 107 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 155–168, here 156. Already Albrecht Alt was convinced, that Deut 27 has to be interpreted as a late addition, cf. A. Alt, "Die Heimat des Deuteronomiums," in *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, vol. 2 (Munich: Kaiser, 1953), 250–275.

[38] For a different view, see Schorch, "Samaritan Version" (see n. 33), 26–29, who maintains that Deut 11 and 27 are part of the original layers of Deuteronomy, which as a whole he interprets as a Northern document from around the mid-eighth century BCE. Yet, the theory has several serious exegetical shortcomings (for details, see B. Hensel, "Deuteronomium 12,13–19: Zur Lokalisierung des einen Maqom," *BN* NF 182 [2019], 9–43) and the historical problem that the Mount Gerizim sanctuary was (most likely) not erected *before* the fifth century BCE.

[39] For the comparison of Deut 27 and Exod 20, see Knoppers, "Northern Context" (see n. 35), 180 f.

of the sanctuary on Mount Gerizim.[40] This allowed, according to Nihan, "the coexistence of both cultic sites, *despite* the centralization law."[41]

I would like to modify this view in several respects: On the one hand, it is likely that both mentions of Mount Gerizim here are Persian-period redactional interpolations, as Deut 27:4–8 breaks the original context of Deut 12–26, 28* and thereby transfers the place of the ceremony from Transjordan (Moab) – which is mentioned in the immediate context in Deut 26:1, 16–19; 27:1–3 and 28:69 – to Mount Gerizim *inside* the land (Deut 27:4, 8). But I doubt the plausibility of a dual mode of argument concerning cult centralization. Effectively this implies a specific hierarchy, with Deuteronomy's central shrine in Jerusalem being the "real temple," and Mount Gerizim being just another shrine to be summed up amongst the "several shrines" from the older altar law of the Exodus tradition.[42]

Such a hierarchy cannot be inferred from Deut 27, however, because – and in contrast to vv. 4 and 8 – Deut 27:5–7[43] does *not* just cite the altar law, but also shows clear parallels to the centralization law in Deut 12 (see Deut 27:7: ואכלת שׁם ושׂמחת לפני יהוה, which parallels Deut 12:7, 12, 18; שׁם, "there," Deut 27:7//12:7; מזבח יהוה, Deut 27:6//12:27; 16:21; 26:4).[44] Mount Gerizim is thus explicitly identified with the sanctuary alluded to in Deut 12. What is avoided here is the so-called centralization formula ("the place [מקום] that YHWH has chosen [בחר]"[45]). I maintain that this is purposeful, as the redactor did not want to make it impossible to identify Jerusalem as the one *maqom*. By adding Deut 11 and 27, Mount Gerizim becomes a possible, but not an exclusive interpretation of the unlocalized *maqom* of Deuteronomy, of the same rank – if you like – as Jerusalem's temple.

Of further importance is the compositional emphasis Mount Gerizim gets, as the public ceremonies mentioned in Deut 11:26–32 and 27:1–26 on Mount Gerizim and Mount Ebal bracket the central legal collection (Deut 12–26,

---

[40] To be clear here, Deut 11 or 27 does *not* mention any kind of sanctuary, just an altar. But given the evidence that in later days the mentioning of "Mount Gerizim" in Deut 27:4 was purposely changed to "Mount Ebal" (see below), this might be taken as indication that Deut 11 and 27 were understood as a kind of *etiology* of the Samarian sanctuary.

[41] Nihan, "The Torah between Samaria and Judah" (see n. 29), 216. On Deut 27, see also Knoppers, "Northern Context" (see n. 35), 162–183, with similar observations.

[42] See, e. g., Knoppers, *Jews and Samaritans* (see n. 7), 209, who states: "the altar of Deut 27:5–7 could be understood simply as one instantiation of the altar legislation presented in Exodus."

[43] Following Müller, "Altar" (see n. 32), 210, the vv. 5–7 are within vv. 1–8 probably the youngest redactional layer.

[44] On the parallels, Müller, "Altar" (see n. 32), 210 f.

[45] The centralization formula of Deuteronomy appears twenty-one times in Deuteronomy (in a short and a long version): Deut 12:5, 11, 14, 18, 21, 26; 14:23, 24, 25; 15:20; 16:2, 6, 7, 11, 15, 16; 17:8, 10; 18:6; 26:2; 31:11.

28*).[46] Deuteronomy 27:11–13 transfers the ceremony of blessing in Deut 28, where it was originally located in Moab (Deut 28:69), to the *inside* of the land: on Mount Gerizim. Moab becomes in this way, as Eckart Otto formulated it, "a gateway station on the way to Mount Gerizim" ("eine Durchgangsstation auf dem Weg zum Berg Garizim").[47] The Samarian sanctuary becomes the actual *destination of Deuteronomy*. With Mount Gerizim standing at such strategic positions, it seems clear that the interpolation is not only a *concession* towards Samarian interests. It is also and even more so an *acknowledgment of the importance* of the Northern sanctuary. This suggests that Samarian leaders or scribes were able to promote their interests subtly, but effectively, through the common redaction of Deuteronomy.

3.2 The Priestly Writings

Within the pentateuchal traditions the Priestly document also seems to bear several concessionary strategies. Certain strands of the Priestly traditions, amongst them the texts that address and describe the wilderness cult, have proven secondary in character (compared to the *Priestergrundschrift* [Pg]) and seem to stem from the early Persian era.[48] These texts could therefore possibly reflect Judean-Samarian relations of this very period. It is striking that these strands explicitly affirm the importance of Northern and Southern cultic *collaboration* in a centralized and ideally unified imagination of a pan-Israelite Yahwistic cult with even a *shared* high priest (see esp. Exod 28).[49] It is remarkable, though, that the question how this "unity" is to translate into reality is left open: In the Priestly writings, the sanctuary, called the "tent of meeting" (אהל מועד), is portable, effectively promoting a significantly less centralized view of the Israelite cult than Deuteronomy. Depending on the historical setting to which one assigns P, this either purposely *avoids* identifying the sanctuary with one *specific* site.[50] It could also legitimize the multiplicity of Yahwistic shrines within the land.[51] I am mainly thinking here of a negotiation between the two

---

[46] For a similar observation, see Knoppers, "Northern Context" (see n. 35), 162–183.

[47] Otto, *Deuteronomium 12–34* (see n. 37), 2.1930.

[48] For the discussions around the dating of P materials, see, e. g., R. Achenbach, *Die Vollendung der Tora: Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Numeribuches im Kontext von Hexateuch und Pentateuch*, BZABR 3 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2003), 443–556.

[49] On this issue, see C. Nihan and J. Rhyder, "Aaron's Vestments in Exodus 28 and Priestly Leadership," in *Debating Authority: Concepts of Leadership in the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets*, ed. K. Pyschny and S. Schulz, BZAW 507 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2018), 45–67.

[50] See M. Douglas, *Leviticus as Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 90–98; see also C. Nihan, "Cult Centralization and the Torah Traditions in Chronicles," in Dubovský, Markl, and Sonnet, *The Fall of Jerusalem* (see n. 37), 253–288, for the discussion.

[51] See B.J. Diebner, "Gottes Welt, Moses Zelt und das salomonische Heiligtum," in *Lectio difficilior probabilior? L'exégèse comme expérience de décloisonnement*, ed. T. Römer, DBAT Beiheft 12 (Heidelberg: Esprint, 1991), 127–154.

"central sanctuaries" at Jerusalem and Mount Gerizim. The possibility that both Northern *and* Southern groups might claim to be the rightful heirs of the centralized cult of the wilderness period *is left open* by P. In my interpretation this constitutes a concessive text strategy, respecting and promoting both Judean and Samarian interests.

This concessive nature of P remains true even if one agrees with the thoroughly developed theory of Julia Rhyder that the Priestly writings seemingly *favor* the Southern (Judean) perspective.[52] I personally think Rhyder's observations on the centrality discourse in P are accurate, as P envisages (albeit in a very subtle way) an *ideal hierarchy* between south and north: for example, the organization of the tribes around the sanctuary has the tribe of Judah at the first place in Num 1–10 (Num 2:3); the appointment of the Judean leader Nahshon for the march across the wilderness (Num 2 and 10, etc.; cf. Exod 6:13–26); the commandment that the camp of Judah must "set out first on the march" (לצבאתם ראשנה יסעו, Num 2:9); the image of Judean leaders taking charge of the wilderness cult, with only *the assistance* of Northerners, in texts like Exod 6:13–26; 31:1–11; Num 2 and 10.

This hierarchy reflects Judean hopes of grandeur and importance, probably because they had little of either in reality. But – and this is the decisive point I am going to make here – while favoring the Southern cult over the Northern, Samarian tradition is not discarded or de-legitimized within the overall concept of P. These tendencies in the late Priestly texts suggest that Judean scribes responsible for the Priestly traditions were able to subtly promote their (Southern) interests, thereby asserting Judah's right before all other tribes. The sanctuary on Mount Gerizim is thereby not opposed but included in the imagination of a mobile tent shrine.

4. Temple and Torah: Some Conclusions on a Judean-Samarian Debate in the Formative Period

This brief sketch of the recent discussion, which could easily be supplemented by further examples from the Pentateuch, indicates that the issue of Samarian involvement in the Hebrew Bible and the Pentateuch is significantly more complex than previously assumed. On that basis, the following provisional conclusions and viewpoints can now be articulated regarding the question of Samarian involvement in the formative period, especially in the formation of the Torah:

---

[52] For details on the Northern and Southern collaboration in the P materials, see the recently published PhD thesis by Julia Rhyder: *Centralizing the Cult: The Holiness Legislation of Leviticus 17–26*, FAT 134 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019).

(1) Contrary to the current majority view, the formation process of early Judaism(s) reflects less an innovative achievement of an elite group of Judean exiles than a complex and multilayered process of *negotiation between diverse groups*. This thesis leads to the corollary that the late texts of the Hebrew Bible *reflect* this debate. With regard to the religious and cultural-historical achievements of the postexilic epoch (here: temple and Torah), certain texts *react* to the parallel developments of these groups.

(2) The pentateuchal traditions referenced here imply a relationship between Judeans and Samarians in which the two provinces coexisted side by side in the Persian period and appear to have understood their relation not in terms of competition (not even around the erection of the sanctuary on Mount Gerizim in the fifth century)[53] but of concordance. The Common Torah promotes a *pan-Israelite imagination* of "Israel" (including Judah *and* Samaria) and is created as a normative account or a narrative presentation of the characteristics and criteria common to all groups of the "Israelite" cultural spectrum. The Torah is formulated in such a way that each group can find their interests represented, by leaving gaps when it comes to specific cultic issues. The specific group could fill in the gap in the context of their respective community.[54] In the examples presented here this concerns the location of the legitimate cultic site, which is never specified in Deuteronomy, the Priestly writings and the overall Pentateuch. The Common Torah represents the *status quo* of the late Persian period, when the redaction and publication of the Pentateuch was probably finalized.[55]

(3) The unity of Israel promoted in this way in the Pentateuch is by nature an *idealized discourse*, rather than a reflection of historical socio-cultic realities. It is hardly conceivable that there were real attempts to establish a common Israelite cult with one common central sanctuary.

(4) The current discussion of Samarian involvement in the formation of the pentateuchal traditions needs to take the complex negotiation process of Ju-

---

[53] On the dating of the temple into the first half of the fifth century BCE, see Magen, *Mount Gerizim Excavations*, vol. 2 (see n. 17), 167–170; id., "Dating" (see n. 19), 176 f.; for criticism, see Dušek, *Inscriptions* (see n. 6), 3 (second half of the 5th cent.). For some considerations that the sanctuary could be older, see Hensel, *Juda und Samaria* (see n. 10), 43–47, and J. Dušek, "Mt. Gerizim Sanctuary: Its History and Enigma of Origin," *HeBAI* 3 (2014), 111–133, esp. 128 f.

[54] My preliminary thoughts on the hermeneutics of the Common Torah/Pentateuch in Hensel, *Juda und Samaria* (see n. 10), 170–194 (venturing from there I changed my view in several details – especially the role and concept of centralization within the different pentateuchal traditions of centralization), here also with more examples besides P and Deuteronomy and the concessive strategies (especially within the Joseph-Judah narrative Gen 37–50 [pp. 183–187], and a discussion of the evidence from Qumran manuscripts, bearing significant Samaritan features [pp. 173–176, 244–247]).

[55] See, e.g., C. Nihan, "The Emergence of the Pentateuch as 'Torah,'" *RC* 4.6 (2010), 353–364.

dean-Samarian interests more seriously. It is not just by small redactional additions or *glossae* that Samarian interests are here and there added to a more or less *predominantly Judean text*. This was originally presumed for Deut 11 and 27: Mount Gerizim is added to the list of other legitimate sanctuaries. The distinctive point my thesis makes here, is that the emphasis on unity, concessions or collaboration *does not mean* that the scribes imagined total *"equality"* between Samaria and Judah. As could be demonstrated, Deuteronomy's redactional additions articulate specific *Samarian interests*, which Judeans *had to* or *wanted to* agree to – at least in the time of concordance; and the Priestly writings promoted *Judean interests* and implied a certain Judean-Samarian hierarchy in cultic issues.[56]

(5) *Outside the Torah*, this compromise was disputed. What is more, the mainly Judean traditions of the Nevi'im and Ketuvim show rather different opinions, like when in the Deuteronomistic History (Josh–Kgs) clearly Jerusalem is pointed out as the *only* legitimate *maqom* – a view that is even further sharpened in Ezra-Nehemiah and Chronicles.[57] Also, the "Israel" imagined in

---

[56] For a further example, where Samarian or Judean interests are promoted under the surface for the "Concessive Torah," see my reading of the Joseph-Judah narrative Gen 37–50 (Hensel, *Juda und Samaria* [see n. 10], 183–187). I interpret this narrative (at least at its latest redactional layer) as an ideological text of negotiating Samarian-Judean interests from the Persian period. Joseph (i.e., Samaria) is the blessed firstborn and thus privileged amongst his brothers in Israel. A key passage in my reading is Gen 50:15–21, where it is stated that Joseph/Samaria is responsible for the survival of whole Israel (and thus also for Judah). Judah, on the other hand, the Davidic tribe(!), does never receive an explicit blessing. This is also true for the whole Torah (no explicit blessing is stated in Deut 33, too). But, as a sort of compensation, Judah receives "political power" amongst his brothers, cf. Gen 49:8–12.

[57] The Book of Ezra-Nehemiah in its present form seems to display strong anti-Samarian "hermeneutics," in a way that it de-legitimizes the Northern YHWH-worshipers and their sanctuary (see Hensel, *Juda und Samaria* [see n. 10], 283–366, esp. 363–365, for the details; cf. also id., "Ethnic Fiction and Identity-Formation: A New Explanation for the Background of the Question of Intermarriage in Ezra-Nehemiah," in Kartveit and Knoppers, *The Bible, Qumran, and the Samaritans* [see n. 13], 135–150; and Heckl, *Neuanfang* [see n. 9]). This is especially visible in the interpolated (and in itself multilayered) addition of Ezra 4:1–24 in the context of the temple-restoration narrative Ezra 5–6. Chronicles on the other hand, combines a certain Jerusalem-centered interpretation of Deuteronomy and the tabernacle of P. Chronicles purposely dismisses the concessive concept in Deuteronomy by combining the election of Jerusalem in the Former Prophets with the election of the one *maqom* in Deuteronomy, and presents the temple of Jerusalem as the only legitimate representation of this cultic site. For both concepts of delegitimization of the Samarian sanctuary see in detail B. Hensel, "Ezra-Nehemiah and Chronicles: New Insights into the Early History of Samari(t)an-Jewish Relations," *Religions* 11.98 (2020), 1–24. On the concept of centralization in Chronicles, and this concept receives its *Vorlage* in Kings by combining it (and thereby changing it) with the concepts from P and Deuteronomy, see Nihan, "Cult Centralization" (see n. 50), 253–288; and C. Nihan and H. Gonzalez, "Competing Attitudes toward Samaria in Chronicles and Second Zechariah," in Kartveit and Knoppers, *The Bible, Qumran, and the Samaritans* (see n. 13), 93–114.

Ezra-Nehemiah is not the pan-Israel from the Pentateuch, but an exclusivist concept comprising only the Judean returnees from exile.[58] On the other hand, the Common Torah is also consistent with various postexilic texts, in particular from the prophetic tradition, which nourished hopes of the restoration of all Israel following the exile (see, e.g., Jer 30:3, 8–9; 31:27–28, 31–34; Ezek 34:23–21; 37:15–28; Obad 18–21; Isa 11:11–16; Jer 3:18; Zech 9:9–13; 10:6–10). The discourse surrounding the definition of "Israel"[59] and whether it did or did not include Samaria shows that the external borders of "Israel" – together with its internal structures and distinctions – were still undergoing a process of negotiation at this time. Apparently, for Judah there was no getting around Samarian Yahwism during this period – at least for the time being.[60]

(6) Most likely, the souring of relations between Samaria and Judea in the Hellenistic era lead to giving up on the concessionary character of this Torah. A historical echo of this process is very likely the Ezra narrative with its focus on the Judean Torah, which is bound to Jerusalem within the literary world, as only Ezra, the Aaronite priest, and Judean scribes attest to its legitimacy – the Samarian version is illicit within this ideological construction.[61] What actually happened historically is that, in the process of Samarian-Judean estrangement, each group added group-specific textual layers to their versions of the Torah, emphasizing especially the legitimacy of their respective cultic center by slight textual changes. The Judean layers (which later lead to the Masoretic Text)

---

[58] On the postexilic conceptions of "Israel" within Ezra-Nehemiah, see for details K. Weingart, *Stämmevolk – Staatsvolk – Gottesvolk? Studien zur Verwendung des Israel-Namens im Alten Testament*, FAT 2/68 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 67–94; Hensel, *Juda und Samaria* (see n. 10), 302–349; and M. Häusl, "Einleitung: Begründungen für die Neukonstituierung des nachexilischen Israel," in *Denkt nicht mehr an das Frühere! Begründungsressourcen in Esra/Nehemia und Jes 40–66 im Vergleich*, ed. M. Häusl, BBB 184 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2018), 9–31, esp. 19–22.

[59] For the processes of constructing Israelite identity, see now the excellent volumes by E. Ben Zvi and D.V. Edelman, eds., *Imagining the Other and Constructing Israelite Identity in the Early Second Temple Period*, LHBOTS 591 (New York: Bloomsbury, 2015); and E. Bons and K. Finsterbusch, eds., *Konstruktionen individueller und kollektiver Identität*, vol. 1: *Altes Israel/Frühjudentum, griechische Antike, Neues Testament/Alte Kirche*, Biblisch-Theologische Studien 161 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2016).

[60] The identification of "Israel" with its denomination "Judah" became the prevalent term in religious history and politics from the Hasmonean time onwards (at the latest); see also M. Böhm, "Wer gehörte in hellenistisch-römischer Zeit zu 'Israel'? Historische Vorrausetzungen für eine veränderte Perspektive auf neutestamentliche Texte," in *Die Samaritaner und die Bibel: Historische und literarische Wechselwirkungen zwischen biblischen und samaritanischen Traditionen*, ed. J. Frey et al., SJ 70/Studia Samaritana 7 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012), 181–202.

[61] Cf. R. Heckl, "The Composition of Ezra-Nehemiah as a Testimony for the Competition between the Temples in Jerusalem and on Mt. Gerizim in the Early Years of the Seleucid Rule over Judah," in Kartveit and Knoppers, *The Bible, Qumran, and the Samaritans* [see n. 13], 115–132, here 123; Hensel, *Juda und Samaria* (see n. 10), 304–306.

included the textual change of Deut 27:4 from "Gerizim" to "Ebal," which is then taken up by the even later addition of Josh 8:30–35 MT.[62] The change in Deut 27:4 effectively dismisses the positive connotation of the altar building on Mount Gerizim in Deut 27 and the concessions made towards the Samarian worshipers, when Deut 27 was added to Deut 12–26, 28*. The change is made *after* the main redaction of the Torah. The anti-Samarian change of Mount Gerizim/Mount Ebal could be interconnected with the change from the past tense בחר (*qatal*) in reference to the "chosen place" in Deut 12* and in the centralization formula to the formula's future in the Masoretic Text (יבחר/Q). Adrian Schenker has shown that the use of the past tense is supported in Greek manuscripts, which are unrelated to the Samaritan traditions and may reflect the original reading of the Deuteronomy.[63] Where the original past tense allowed the identification of the unnamed *maqom* with either Jerusalem or Mount Gerizim, the later change to the future tense in the Judean textual tradition makes it very clear that only Jerusalem is the chosen place. The Hebrew יבחר points *explicitly* and *exclusively* to the election of Jerusalem and Judah reported – outside Deuteronomy – in the Books of Samuel and Kings.[64] Jerusalem is exclusively interpreted as "the place that I will choose" – Mount Gerizim is delegitimized.[65] The Samarian layer expands the Ten Commandments, by adding after Exod 20:17 and Deut 5:18 a mélange of texts taken from Exod 13:11a; Deut 11:29b; 27:2b–3b, 4a SP, 5–7,[66] which all emphasize the legitimacy of Mount Gerizim as the place that YHWH has chosen. By these changes, Mount Gerizim, respectively Mount Zion, were interpreted as the only legitimate representation of the one cultic place in Israel. The Hasmonean destruction of Mount Gerizim is a tangible manifestation of this interpretation process.

---

[62] On Josh 8:30–35, see Nihan, "The Torah between Samaria and Judah" (see n. 29), 217–222; for the secondary character of Josh 8, cf. Müller, "Altar" (see n. 32), 214.

[63] See Schenker, "Le Seigneur" (see n. 33), 339; cf. Schorch, "Samaritan Version" (see n. 33). Differently Heckl, who pleads for the *yiqtol* of the Masoretic Text as the original reading, see R. Heckl, "Überlegungen zu Form und Funktion der Zentralisationsformel im Konzept des samaritanischen Pentateuchs, zugleich ein Plädoyer für die Ursprünglichkeit der masoretischen Lesart," *ZABR* 23 (2017), 191–208.

[64] See, e.g., 1Kgs 14:21; cf. Ps 78:68, or the election of the dynasty of David, king of Judah, in Jerusalem.

[65] On the hermeneutics of the changes from בחר to יבחר, see Hensel, "Deuteronomium 12,13–19" (see n. 38), esp. 18–23, 35.

[66] See Pummer, *Josephus* (see n. 16), 25f., for a discussion of the text.

5. Research Perspectives: Considering Hexateuch Redactions and Possible *Pre-Persian* Samarian Scribal Involvements

We need to imagine for the Samarians a more active role in the formative period of early Judaism, especially in the formation of the Torah and the process of developing central religious ideas, such as the notion of cult centralization. It is also open for discussion if one should reckon with a Samarian influence on the Hexateuch. The final chapter of Joshua can be named here, Josh 24, where the promulgation of the law for all Israel (meaning: Judah and Samaria) is situated in Shechem, at the foot of Mount Gerizim.[67] Although nearly every possible dating has been proposed for this concluding narrative that contains Joshua's farewell address after the conquest of the land, the assumption that this chapter is a postexilic text has increased significantly in recent scholarship.[68] If Thomas Römer is right that Josh 24 with its prominent Northern "Samaritan" location was created in order to produce a Hexateuch in the Persian period, and to integrate the Book of Joshua into the Torah,[69] then *this* work could probably also be seen as a Judean-Samarian coproduction. In this scenario, Hexateuch and Pentateuch could be understood as competing book-conceptions. Although the idea of a Hexateuch could not be materialized in the end in a Torah containing six scrolls, the postbiblical traditions about Joshua amongst the Samaritans remained popular, as the Samaritan Chronicles of Joshua demonstrate.[70] Eckart Otto has a comparable concept of competing Hexa- and Pentateuch ideas in mind that propose to competing concepts of "Israel" in the Persian period: a "klein-judäische Lösung" (i.e., the Pentateuch) and a "groß-israelitische Lösung" (i.e., an "Israel" imagination that comprises Judean and Samarian interests).[71] I am not (yet) convinced that Otto is right in seeing the Pentateuch (especially the core of Deuteronomy) as a *Judean-only* document ("klein-judäisch") regarding my observations above. But the issue

---

[67] See the recent treatment of the text by Schmid, "Overcoming" (see n. 14), 23–29; Römer, "Cult Centralization" (see n. 31), 89 f.; id., "Das doppelte Ende des Josuabuches: Einige Anmerkungen zur aktuellen Diskussion um 'deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk' und 'Hexateuch,'" *ZAW* 118 (2006), 523–548.

[68] A plead for a Persian dating offer, e.g., Schmid, "Overcoming" (see n. 14), 29, the works of Thomas Römer cited in this article, and Nihan, "The Torah between Samaria and Judah" (see n. 29), 193–199.

[69] See Römer, "Das doppelte Ende" (see n. 67), 523–548; see also T. Römer and M.Z. Brettler, "Deuteronomy 34 and the Case for a Persian Hexateuch," *JBL* 119 (2000), 401–419.

[70] See I. Hjelm, *Jerusalem's Rise to Sovereignty: Zion and Gerizim in Competition*, JSOT Sup 404 (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 195–210.

[71] See Otto, *Deuteronomium 12–34* (see n. 37), 1.1132 f.; in a similar way R. Achenbach, "Pentateuch, Hexateuch und Enneateuch: Eine Verhältnisbestimmung," *ZABR* 11 (2005), 122–154, who differentiates between a "Hexateuch" redactor and a later "Pentateuch" redactor.

of hexateuchal and pentateuchal redactions with regard to a possible Samarian involvement definitively needs further investigation.[72]

What is more, prior research is right to look at the possible Samarian involvement in Persian-period redactional processes. But what I identify as a major task for future studies is to pay more attention to Samarian contributions *prior* to this period. One key insight of Samaritan studies is that there was far more ethnic and cultural continuity of Northern groups *after* 722 BCE than the biblical narratives imply. It is mainly the recent works of Knoppers that should be acknowledged for highlighting this in the available sources.[73] Whilst there were of course a number of disasters and upheavals in the region as a result of the Assyrian conquest, their outcomes were not fundamentally dissimilar to those which Judah is assumed to have undergone some 150 years later when it was also conquered. It is only in the historical reflections of certain Old Testament texts that the North is said to have disappeared completely. Thus, it is possible that the so-called Northern tradition was not simply adapted by the Judeans after 722 BCE, as commonly held. Further Samarian involvement in the shaping of their tradition long after this date is plausible.

To give just one short example from the traditions mentioned here: I remain skeptical if the first edition of the Deuteronomy (the "Ur-Deuteronomy") really does promote pure Judean interests as is commonly presumed.[74] Even in the

---

[72] For a recent overview of the Hexateuch/Pentateuch debate, see S. Germany, "The Hexateuch Hypothesis: A History of Research and Current Approaches," *CurBR* 16.2 (2018), 131–156, esp. 142–143 ("The Theory of a 'Redactional Hexateuch'"); and R. Albertz, "The Recent Discussion on the Formation of the Pentateuch/Hexateuch," *HS* 59 (2018), 65–92, esp. 79–82.

[73] Cf. G.N. Knoppers, "Revisiting the Samaritan Question in the Persian Period," in *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period*, ed. M. Oeming and O. Lipschits (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 265–289; id., "Cutheans or Children of Jacob? The Issue of Samaritan Origins in 2 Kings 1," in *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld*, ed. R. Rezetko, VTSup 113 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 223–239, the core findings of which can now be found in id., *Jews and Samaritans* (see n. 7), esp. 103–109. In my study I added further material, archaeological evidence and perspective to his observations, see Hensel, *Juda und Samaria* (see n. 10), 91–102 ("Ethnische und kulturelle Kontinuität im Norden: archäologische und demographisch-soziologische Aspekte").

[74] This is mainly the case because of the historical connection of Ur-Deuteronomy's core Deut 12* (and related texts) with Josiah's cultic reform in the late monarchic era of Judah (cf. 2 Kgs 22–23*), which was originally proposed by de Wette already in the nineteenth century and had major impact on critical research of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries (the impact of this theory on recent research is beyond the scope of this article, but see the very detailed discussions provided by M. Pietsch, *Die Kultreform Josias: Studien zur Religionsgeschichte Israels in der späten Königszeit*, FAT 86 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013], 1–23, 160–430, and Otto, *Deuteronomium 12–34* [see n. 37], 1.1188–1191; for the debate about the historicity of Josiah's reform, see, e.g., C. Uehlinger, "Was There a Cult Reform under King Josiah?," in *Good Kings and Bad Kings*, ed. L.L. Grabbe, JSOTSup 393 [London: T&T Clark, 2007], 297–316). Another important reason for assuming a Judean background of Deuteronomy is the possible connection of the arrangement of Deuteronomy (esp. Deut

presumably oldest core, Deut 12:13–19, the one *maqom* is not mentioned nor named.[75] Ur-Deuteronomy does *not* transmit an exclusivist Judean perspective. There is a lot that should be debated here – especially regarding what can be said about the historicity of the presumed cultic reforms in the late monarchic era, and regarding the interrelation of Deuteronomy with the so-called Deuteronomistic History (Josh, Sam, and Kgs), to which Deuteronomy later was subsequently linked, and which features a significantly Jerusalem-centered perspective on cultic affairs.[76] I addressed the whole discussion in a recent article.[77] Despite many open questions there, I propose that already Deut 12:13–19 demonstrates a certain awareness or willingness to integrate Samarian interests within the idea of centralization that might have developed in the time of late monarchy, or – a date to which I am more inclined to – in the early exilic period.[78] In the time of the Ur-Deuteronomy, the Samarian *maqom* in mind would not be Mount Gerizim. It would have to be examined, which Northern sanc-

---

13:2–10* and 28:20–44*) and the Assyrian Vassal Treaties, which would situate the origins of Deuteronomy in the mid/late sixth century BCE – a rather impactful and convincing (yet, not uncontested: see, e.g., R.G. Kratz, "The Idea of Cultic Centralization, and Its Supposed Ancient Near Eastern Analogies," in *One God – One Cult – One Nation: Archaeological and Biblical Perspectives*, ed. R.G. Kratz and H. Spieckermann, BZAW 405 [Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010], 121–144) theory put forward, namely, by Otto in his works (see his fundamental work: E. Otto, *Das Deuteronomium: Politische Theologie und Rechtsreform in Juda und Assyrien*, BZAW 284 [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999], 15–90). A third reason are the literary connections of Deuteronomy with the Former Prophets, which are interpreted literary-historically as one major literary work ("Deuteronomistisches Geschichtswerk" in Noth's terminology; on Noth's impact on research, see U. Rüterswörden, ed., *Martin Noth – aus der Sicht der heutigen Forschung*, Biblisch-Theologische Studien 58 [Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2004]). As Joshua–Kings promote a Jerusalem and Judah-centered perspective, this view is presupposed for Deuteronomy (even if the book does not mention Jerusalem explicitly).

[75] The general notion that the central place in Deuteronomy is unnamed and therefore not necessarily to be identified with Mount Zion/Jerusalem has been legitimately stressed in the last couple of years; see, e.g., Nihan, "Cult Centralization" (see n. 50), 254f.; Müller, "Altar" (see n. 32), 197f.; A.C. Hagedorn, "Placing (a) God: Central Place Theory in Deuteronomy 12 and at Delphi," in *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*, ed. J. Day, LHBOTS 422 (London: T&T Clark, 2005), 188–211; Hensel, *Juda und Samaria* (see n. 10), 176–183. For a detailed analysis of Deut 12:13–19 and what option for identification with Jerusalem the text offers or how it strategically codes the description of the place, so that Samarian and Judean interests can be met here, see my article "Deuteronomium 12,13–19" (see n. 38).

[76] On the first edition of Deuteronomy, see now R. Achenbach, "Überlegungen zur Rekonstruktion des Urdeuteronomiums," *ZABR* 24 (2018), 211–254.

[77] See Hensel, "Deuteronomium 12,13–19" (see n. 38).

[78] The most common dating is into the late monarchic period. Newer approaches opt for a neo-Babylonian or early-Persian dating, see, e.g., Kratz, "Idea" (see n. 74), 121; and Juha Pakkala's works (e.g., "Deuteronomy and 1–2 Kings in the Redaction of the Pentateuch and Former Prophets," in *Deuteronomy in the Pentateuch, Hexateuch, and the Deuteronomistic History*, ed. K. Schmid and R. Person, FAT 2/56 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012], 133–162).

tuary the centralization law of Deuteronomy is referencing to. Bethel offers a fundamental, albeit archaeologically hardly provable option for this.[79] Another possibility would be that the authors were creating an imagined center for the Israelites – after the downfall of the Northern and Southern kingdoms in order to preserve group identity.[80] At the latest, however, with the erection of the sanctuary at Mount Gerizim it is clear that Deut 12 and related texts are understood as one – but not exclusive – reference to Mount Gerizim.

The concept of Ur-Deuteronomy, which I would like to call *concessive*, is even kept up when Deuteronomy was successively linked with the first editions of the Former Prophets (esp. Sam–Kgs),[81] which on their side present a very Jerusalem-centered view. Deuteronomy is at every stage of the *Fortschreibung* left open for Samarian contexts, respectively: despite the deepened connections with (Joshua–)Samuel–Kings' Jerusalem perspective, Deuteronomy does not adapt these specifications. Within Deuteronomy the identification of the *maqom* with the temple in Jerusalem remains (also and especially because of the *qatal* of the centralization formula) always a possible, but at no time an exclusive interpretation.

---

[79] That Bethel was intact after 722 BCE is proposed by E.A. Knauf, "Bethel: The Israelite Impact on Judean Language and Literature," in Oeming and Lipschits, *Judah and the Judeans* (see n. 73), 291–349; id., "The Glorious Days of Manasseh," in *Data and Debates: Essays in the History and Culture of Israel and Its Neighbours in Antiquity*, ed. H.M. Niemann, K. Schmid, and S. Schroer, AOAT 407 (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2013), 251–275, here 273. Referencing Knauf's proposal and with literary-critical consequences for the Bethel episodes of the Jacob cycle, see U. Becker, "Jakob in Bet-El und Sichem," in *Die Erzväter in der biblischen Tradition: Festschrift Matthias Köckert*, ed. A.C. Hagedorn and H. Pfeiffer, BZAW 400 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009), 159–185; see also Davies, "Monotheism" (see n. 4), 31–33. On the missing archaeological evidences for the sixth to fourth century BCE, see I. Finkelstein and L. Singer-Avitz, "Reevaluating Bethel," *ZDPV* 125.1 (2009), 33–48. But see now O. Lipschits, "Bethel Revisited," in *Rethinking Israel: Studies in the History and Archaeology of the Ancient Israel in Honor of Israel Finkelstein*, ed. O. Lipschits, Y. Gadot, and M.J. Adams (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2017), 233–245, with a presentation of yet unpublished findings at E.P. 915, that may indicate activity in Bethel after 722 BCE. I interpret Bethel as a "Samarian" site for the time after 722 BCE and until the building of Mount Gerizim as new Samarian main sanctuary, see Hensel, "Cult Centralization" (see n. 19), 254–257.

[80] On this aspect of centralization, see Kratz, "Idea" (see n. 74); C.L. Crouch, *The Making of Israel: Cultural Diversity in the Southern Levant and the Formation of the Ethnic Identity in Deuteronomy*, VTSup 162 (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 133–139.

[81] On the (possibility of) different and independent origins of Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History, see K. Schmid, "Deuteronomy within the 'Deuteronomistic Histories' in Genesis–2 Kings," in Schmid and Person, *Deuteronomy in the Pentateuch* (see n. 78), 8–30.

Torah, Temple, Land

Edited by
MARKUS WITTE,
JENS SCHRÖTER,
and VERENA LEPPER

Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism

Mohr Siebeck

Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism

Edited by

Maren Niehoff (Jerusalem)
Annette Y. Reed (New York, NY)
Seth Schwartz (New York, NY)
Moulie Vidas (Princeton, NJ)

184

Torah, Temple, Land

Constructions of Judaism in Antiquity

Edited by

Markus Witte, Jens Schröter,
and Verena M. Lepper

Mohr Siebeck

Markus Witte, born 1964; Dr. theol.; Professor of Exegesis and Literary History of the Old Testament at the Faculty of Theology, Humboldt University Berlin.

Jens Schröter, born 1961; Dr. theol.; Professor of Exegesis and Theology of the New Testament and Ancient Christian Apocrypha at the Faculty of Theology, Humboldt University Berlin.

Verena M. Lepper, born 1973; Dr. phil.; Curator of the Egyptian and Oriental Papyrus Collection, Egyptian Museum and Papyrus Collection, National Museums, Berlin, SPK & Honorary Professor at Humboldt University Berlin.

European Research Council
Established by the European Commission

ISBN 978-3-16-159853-1 / eISBN 978-3-16-159854-8
DOI 10.1628/978-3-16-159854-8

ISSN 0721-8753 / eISSN 2568-9525 (Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism)

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available at *http://dnb.dnb.de*.

© 2021 Mohr Siebeck Tübingen, Germany. www.mohrsiebeck.com

This work is licensed under the license „Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International“ (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0). A complete Version of the license text can be found at: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/.“

Any use not covered by the above license is prohibited and illegal without the permission of the publisher.

The book was printed on non-aging paper by Gulde-Druck in Tübingen, and bound by Spinner in Ottersweier.

Printed in Germany.

Table of Contents

Abbreviations

Abbreviations in this volume generally follow the guidelines in *The SBL Handbook of Style*, 2nd ed. (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014). References to papyrological editions conform to the "Checklist of Editions of Greek, Latin, Demotic, and Coptic Papyri, Ostraca, and Tablets" (http://papyri.info/docs/checklist). Additional abbreviations:

Gesenius	W. Gesenius, *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament*, 18th ed. (Heidelberg: Springer, 2013)
GLAJJ	M. Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*, 3 vols. (Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1974–1984)
IAM	J.G. Février et al., eds., *Inscriptions antiques du Maroc* (Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1966–)
IJO	D. Noy et al., eds., *Inscriptiones Judaicae Orientis*, 3 vols. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004)
ILJug	A. Šašel and J. Šašel, eds., *Inscriptiones Latinae quae in Iugoslavia ... repertae et editae sunt*, 3 vols. (Ljubljana: Narodni Muzej, 1963–1986)
JIWE	D. Noy, ed., *Jewish Inscriptions of Western Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993–)
MekI	Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael
OED	*Oxford English Dictionary*
TAD	B. Porten and A. Yardeni, *Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt*, 4 vols. (Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 1986–1999)

Introduction

The Holy One, blessed be he, has acquired five acquisitions:
one acquisition is the Torah,
one acquisition are the heavens and the earth,
one acquisition is Abraham,
one acquisition is Israel,
one acquisition is the Temple.
(m. ʾAbot 6:10)

This volume goes back to a conference held at the Theological Faculty of the Humboldt University of Berlin in October 2018 with the title "Torah, Temple, Land: Ancient Construction(s) of Judaism." It brings together articles which address the constellations of ancient Judaism between continuity and change, from the Persian up to the Roman period, by way of a series of case studies from leading experts in their fields who cover a wide range of perspectives. In doing so, diverse forms of Judaism come to the fore which have evolved in different geographical areas: in Elephantine, Samaria, Jerusalem and Judea, in Qumran as well as in Alexandria. Distinctive political, cultural, and social constellations are associated with each of these, in which Jewish communities developed their own conception of themselves and how they were perceived by the outside world. Judaism saw itself confronted with the distinctive contexts and challenges presented by the Persian Empire, Egypt, Greek culture, the Imperium Romanum, and, not least, by emerging Christianity.

Ancient Judaism existed, therefore, in a world which was permanently changing in terms of political, social, and religious parameters. Judaism itself was also subject to constant processes of change, both of its self-perception and its external perception. What was deemed to be "Judaism" or "Jewish" was fluid and often contested with a need for constant renegotiation. In the following, "Judaism" and "Jewish" are, therefore, not to be understood as designations for religious communities with a clearly defined profile, but as heuristic categories to be filled with content in different periods of time and diverse religious, social, and political constellations. As a consequence, current developments in research on ancient Judaism, which highlight the diversity and fluidity of the categories "Judaism" and "Jewish," are taken into account and refined.

Specifically, the individual articles in this volume reflect on a range of categories for describing Judaism and critically evaluate our ability to characterize ancient religious communities in different historical situations in these terms. The contributions are framed against the background of recent research on (re-) constructions of ancient Judaism. The central questions tackled by the speakers

and discussions at the abovementioned conference, as well as by the articles brought together here, were, or respectively are: which factors make it possible to speak of stability or continuity with regard to "ancient Judaism"? How does this relate to change and discontinuity? How may Jewish communities have experienced this relationship themselves in different locations in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman periods and coped with experiencing instability caused by political tensions or changing cultural constellations? And, last but not least, the question of whether and to what extent "Judaism" can be conceived as a (consistent) religious and cultural community with stable characteristics. One particular heuristic line of enquiry poses the question of how different Jewish groups in the period from about 500 BCE up to about 200 CE dealt with the factors of Torah, Temple, and land. These three fundamental pillars for perceptions of the emergence and formation of Israel as God's people are central in the search for understanding what was regarded as "Judaism" in antiquity – both as a mode of self-perception and in the perceptions of outsiders.

This volume aims to shed light on the complexity which can be assumed for ancient Judaism by exploring the significance of the relationship of Torah, the Temple in Jerusalem as a place where heaven and earth meet, and the "holy" or "promised" land as the dwelling place of God's people. This relationship can range from a strict obligation to the Torah, on the one hand, to placing other writings – such as apocalyptic texts – in a central or complementary position, on the other hand. It can be characterized by the conviction that the Jerusalem Temple is the only legitimate holy place for the cult of the God of Israel or reflect practices and texts that suggest the God of Israel can be worshiped in another temple in another land. For the Samaritan tradition the site of the sanctuary excludes Jerusalem. It can range from the conviction that the land of Israel, known variously as Israel, Judah, and Judea, was given by God, even if it was also lost under the rule of the Assyrian, Babylonian, Persian, Greek, and Roman Empires, up to the conception that life in a Greek polis, including the adaptation of Greek language and culture, is a legitimate and appropriate form of existence for worshipers of the God of Israel. For this reason, the institutions of Torah, Temple, and land, regardless of their significance for ancient (and, of course, for present-day) Judaism, do not in any way lead to a consistent image of Judaism or a "common Judaism" (E.P. Sanders). On the contrary, it is precisely the attitude towards these central factors and the creation-theological and historical-theological aspects connected with these that show the diversity of the religious, social, and cultural options which characterize ancient Judaism.

Against this background, this volume contributes to the scholarly debate on determining what we mean by "ancient Judaism" and its cultural and social dimensions, from the disciplinary perspectives of classical, religious, and theological study based on primary texts from the Hebrew Bible, Samarian/Samaritan sources, papyri from Elephantine and Herakleopolis, the Qumran texts

and the so-called Enochic writings, from the works of Philo of Alexandria and the New Testament, epigraphic sources from the Imperium Romanum as well as rabbinic and patristic texts. In the following we offer a brief summary of the political and social framework and highlight the pertinent larger context of the discussion.

Alexander the Great's campaign, which led him from Macedonia up to the Indus and which ended the dominance of the Persians in the eastern Mediterranean area, fundamentally changed the cultures of the Middle East, including those of Israel/Palestine and Egypt. The tremendous speed of Alexander's conquests had a particularly drastic effect on the southern Levant. Noteworthy is his capture of the Phoenician trading city of Tyre, which, in marked contrast to the fate of Jerusalem, the Babylonian king Nebuchadnezzar II (605–562 BCE) ultimately failed to conquer. Alexander's campaign brought about the complete collapse of the Persian Empire, which had been a stable regulatory force for his Jewish subjects. Under Persian rule, a significant degree of political and religious autonomy was granted which resulted in a cultural and religious restoration of Judaism. Alexander's sudden death in 323 BCE in Babylon, the city declared by him to be the capital of his imperium, as well as the battles for succession that followed his death led to the founding of separate monarchies in Mesopotamia/Syria, Asia Minor, Egypt, and Macedonia. These events have left manifold traces in the collective memory of ancient Judaism and played a major role in the transformation of Israelite-Jewish society.

Since the end of the fourth century BCE, Judah had found itself to be at the intersection of conflicts between the kingdoms of the Seleucids in Mesopotamia and Syria and the Ptolemies in Egypt. Within only a century, Judah was the site of six wars between the Ptolemies and the Seleucids, and Jerusalem, including its Yahweh-Temple, was conquered several times. Parts of the land were ravaged, sections of its population deported, and religious autonomy weakened. The following aspects were at least as efficacious as these direct consequences for the land and the central holy places of the Jews: (1) the experiences of varying political and tax systems; (2) the advance of the Greek language which supplanted Aramaic as the *lingua franca* in the eastern Mediterranean; (3) the spread of Greek cults, myths, and schools of philosophy, in particular Stoicism and Epicureanism; (4) the dealing with pagan religious conceptions, including the constantly expanding ruler cult and divine worship of the dead, and subsequently even of living kings and emperors, already in the Hellenistic-Roman period; (5) the encounters with a Greek way of life, with Greek, and later, Roman technology as well as the construction of Greek and Roman cities with their theaters, grammar schools, and schools for ephebi in the whole of the Mediterranean area.

The battles of the Hasmoneans in 167 BCE against the attacks by the Seleucid king Antiochus IV Epiphanes on the religious autonomy of Judah led to

a conflict between pro- and anti-Seleucid circles within Judaism. This conflict brought with it notable economic crises in Israel/Palestine, culminating in the recovery of a religious and political independence and in the establishment of a Judean kingdom for the first time since 587 BCE. Although lacking Davidic or Zadokite legitimation, this Hasmonean kingdom developed into a dynasty which reigned in Judah for about a hundred years. Hasmonean rulers yielded political power over the Jerusalem priesthood and saw themselves as rulers over the only "true Israel," as opposed to the Samarian/Samaritan community which likewise worshiped Yahweh. For the Judean population, the Hasmonean reign signified an autochthonous Hellenistic monarchy which was characterized by a cultural upswing, intense building activity, a geographical expansion as well as considerable violence towards Jewish groups who subscribed to different political and religious orientations both within and, as shown by the conflicts with Samaria and Edom/Idumea, also beyond the borders of the Hasmonean state.

In addition to the political and cultural impact of the appearance of the short-lived imperium of Alexander, the subsequent Diadochi empires as well as the Hasmonean kingdom led to a noticeable increase of the Jewish diaspora. Following the deportations in the Assyrian and Babylonian periods, Jewish communities which cultivated their own cultural and religious traditions had emerged in northern and southern Mesopotamia, Persia, and in the whole of Egypt. In the Hellenistic period, Jewish communities developed across the whole of the Mediterranean area. In particular, the Egyptian diaspora grew rapidly, initially following the deportations under Ptolemy I Soter (367/366–283/282 BCE) in 301 BCE and later through the influx of further Jews. The city of Alexandria, founded in the Nile Delta by Alexander the Great, developed into the cultural metropolis par excellence of the Hellenistic period. Alexandria also became a center of particular attraction for Jewish people. By the third century BCE, the majority of Jews no longer lived in Syria-Palestine, but in the diaspora. Moreover, they no longer spoke predominantly Aramaic or Hebrew, but Greek.

Local differences and multilingualism became a characteristic part of Jewish existence at this time. What is more, certain parameters of Jewish "identity" had already evolved with the establishment of the provinces Samaria and Yehud by the Persians in the sixth century BCE; these distinctive communities became more firmly established in the Hellenistic period and characterized Judaism both in the mother country and in the diaspora. These distinctive identities drew on a number of developments: (1) the Torah in the form of the Pentateuch, the Shema Israel (Deut 6:4–5) and the Decalogue (Exod 20; Deut 5) at the center, irrespective of theological tensions within the Pentateuch and the existence of a Judean alongside a Samaritan Pentateuch (in different versions); (2) the concept that Yahweh is the one and only God, who created the world, who preserves it and directs the paths of history and who is to be worshiped

without image; (3) the awareness of Israel as God's chosen people; (4) the concentration of the cult on the Temple in Jerusalem which did not exclude the existence of other holy places sacred to Yahweh on the Samaritan/Samarian Mount Gerizim and in Leontopolis in Egypt, as well as the establishment of synagogues; and (5) the rites of circumcision, the Sabbath, prayers, fasting, and the giving of alms – religious acts that could be maintained independently of location, as well as the adherence to the laws governing purity and diet.

These five factors – the written Torah, monotheism, election as the chosen people, the Temple as well as circumcision and observing the Sabbath – were interpreted and practiced in different ways, both in the Israelite-Palestinian mother country and the diaspora, already in Persian times and, more intensely, in the Hellenistic period. Different groupings and tendencies emerged within Judaism, which represented different positions, both towards the pagan Greek culture and, beginning with the Maccabean period, also in the attitude towards the Jerusalem kingdom and to the high priest. This process continued more intensely in the Roman period. Therefore, what Jewish "identity" meant in antiquity can hardly be expressed as a common denominator. The social life and religious practices of Jewish communities in Palestine under Roman, and particularly Herodian, rule should be taken into account just as much as those in the Roman colonies, in metropolises like Alexandria and Antioch and the capital Rome. For Jewish communities, the confrontation with Hellenistic culture and Roman politics constituted a continuous challenge between the poles of adaptation and resistance. This led to diverse forms of political, cultural, and religious kinds of reception and integration, which had a lasting influence on both the self-perception and the external perception of "the" Judaism. This "history of intertwining" that is evident both in Israel/Palestine and in the diaspora can be described in terms of "correlation between the center and the periphery," "identity formation from within and without," "rest and motion" and "arts of the weak" which lead to an attempt at integration on equal terms.

In recent research, this differentiation of Judaism has sometimes led to avoid speaking of "Judaism" in the singular in the Hellenistic-Roman period, but of "Judaisms." The plural refers to various strands of Judaism represented, for example, by a Jerusalem, a Samarian, an Egyptian, and a Qumran Judaism. Even this classification still seems to be too undifferentiated with regard to the different groups and geographical regions. The question of the self-perception and external perception of ancient Judaism, represented by different Jewish groups, plays a central role here: are there overlapping features of Judaism alongside the diversity of Judaism? Can we speak of a Jewish "identity" with regard to either self-perception or external perception? The different political, cultural, social, and temporal contexts in the Israelite-Palestinian mother country and in the different centers of the Jewish diaspora, in particular in Egypt (Elephantine, Alexandria, and Leontopolis), have to be taken into account when answering

these questions, as do the interdependencies between these contexts and centers. Against the background of this geographical aspect, the term "land" within the thematic triad of the conference and this volume is explained.

In addition to archaeological and epigraphic records as well as a small number of pagan texts, important sources on the historical description of Judaism in the period concerned are Jewish writings which originated in different places and in different languages during the Persian and Hellenistic-Roman periods. Much of this material reached the form in which it found its way into the Hebrew Bible and the Septuagint during these centuries. Together with non-biblical writings such as the papyri found on the island of Elephantine on the Nile, the vast majority of Jewish-Hellenistic writings not included in the Bible, and the Dead Sea Scrolls, they attest to different literary genres, that is, historiographic, prophetic-mantic, cultural-ritual, sapiental-didactic, juridical, administrative, calendrical, and apocalyptic texts. This demonstrates how ancient Judaism maintained its cultural self-perception in the wake of crises and mutations, each dealing in their own way with central institutions such as kingdom, Temple, land, and sacred writings. In particular the factors of (1) Torah, with its concentration on worshiping the one God Yahweh and the standardization of Jewish identity, (2) Temple, and (3) land appear as stabilizing factors and as indicators for Jewish self-perception.

Emerging Christianity constituted a special kind of religious and social challenge to ancient Judaism. From the beginning, Christianity incorporated the Israelite-Jewish writings and traditions into the basic stock of its lore, interpreted them, however, in its own way. This led to a further transformation of Jewish lore, which was now passed down and interpreted in two ways – in Christian and in Jewish lore. The cooperation, coexistence, and also conflict between Judaism and Christianity led to the concentration of rabbinic Judaism on the Hebrew (and Aramaic) writings, on the one hand, and to the translation of Jewish and Christian texts into Syrian, Coptic, Armenian, and Arabic in the Christian tradition, on the other hand. Even the Septuagint, originally a Jewish translation, was now passed down by Christians and became the first part of the Christian Bible, the "Old Testament." Furthermore, what is important is the interpretative redaction (*Fortschreibung*) of Jewish writings by Christians: relevant examples of this are the Martyrdom of Isaiah, the Fourth Book of Ezra, and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.

The relationship of Judaism and Christianity in antiquity cannot be comprehended with the model of one or more "parting(s) of the ways." The processes relating to this are considerably more complex and have led to diverse forms of "attraction and repulsion" (P. Schäfer). For Judaism, this involved a profound reorientation, concerning the attitude to its own writings and traditions. This is shown by the emergence of the Christian and the Jewish Bibles, into which the authoritative writings of the respective religious communities found their way. The complex processes leading to the collection of these writings reveal

that both in Judaism and Christianity and over a long time authoritative writings were neither clearly delimited as to their extent nor in their wording. The emergence of the Jewish and the Christian Bibles sheds light, therefore, on the diversity of ancient Judaism and ancient Christianity and on the multifaceted processes of their relationships.

The conference to which this volume goes back was supported financially by the Berlin Excellence Cluster Topoi, which has since been discontinued, and by the ERC-Grant Elephantine. We would like to thank the responsible bodies for awarding the funding which made it possible to hold the conference. Janina Skóra has earned a great deal of credit for the organizational preparation and realization of the conference, for which she has our sincere thanks. We thank the speakers for making their lectures available for publication and who also took the discussions during the conference into account for the printed version and waited for the publication with great patience. We thank our staff in Berlin, Veronika Einmahl, Florian Lengle, Lucas Mueller, Brinthanan Puvaneswaran, and Katharina Vetter, for their support in reading the corrections and for compiling the index; thanks to Matthias Müller (Berlin) for preparing the camera-ready copy. Finally, we would like to thank the editors of the series "Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism" for their acceptance of the volume and the staff at Mohr Siebeck publishing house for the great assistance during the publication process.

Berlin, August 2020 *Markus Witte, Jens Schröter, Verena Lepper*